

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,168	04/08/2006	Markus Anliker	TME-2217	2243
			11011/2217	2243
LERNER GRI	7590 07/12/2010 EENBERG STEMER LJ	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 248			STEPHENS III, JOSE S	
HOLLYWOO	D, FL 33022-2480		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3728	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/538,168	ANLIKER, MARKUS		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JOSE S. STEPHENS III	3728		

	JOSE S. STEPHENS III	3728					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 26 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (2) a Notice of Application (3) and (4) are supplied to the following application (4) application (4) and (4) are supplied to the following application (4) are supplied to the following applied to the f	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TV MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period is the date for purposes of the purposes of the set of the control of the expiration date of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); 							
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).							
7. for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
/Ehud Gartenberg/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3728	/Jose S Stephens/ Examiner, Art Unit 3728						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument that Mumford does not disclose anything is disposed in the chamber is not persuasive. Figure 1 of Mumford shows objects in the second chamber, and the area designated as the chamber in the previous office action is clearly capable of containing a suppository. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place a suppository or something of sins raise in the chamber. Applicant's argument that the chamber of Mumford is not sealed is not persuasive because Claim 1 does not claim that any chamber is sealed. Mumford states "the rearward protino or sidewalls 18 of lid 12 are provided with complementary downard and outwardly sloping, opposed cam surfaces 50 which, when the container is in a closed position, closely abut or even contact surfaces 48 in a generally flush-like manner "which means the entire container can be sealed."